Approximation of fractals by discrete graphs: norm convergence of resolvents and spectra

Olaf Post and Jan Simmer

Fachbereich 4 – Mathematik, Universität Trier, 54286 Trier, Germany
E-mail address: olaf.post@uni-trier.de

Fachbereich 4 – Mathematik, Universität Trier, 54286 Trier, Germany
E-mail address: simmer@uni-trier.de

arXiv:1704.00064v1 [math.SP] 31 Mar 2017

Abstract. We show a norm convergence result for the Laplacian on a class of pcf fractals with arbitrary Borel regular probability measure which can be approximated by a sequence of finite-dimensional graph Laplacians with corresponding discrete probability measures.

As a consequence other functions of the Laplacians (heat operator, spectral projections etc.) converge as well in operator norm. One also deduces convergence of the spectrum and the eigenfunctions in energy norm.

1. Introduction

The aim of this article is to apply the abstract setting of convergence of energy forms defined on different Hilbert spaces, developed by the first author in [P12, Pos06] to the case of certain fractals. Details on fractals and precise definitions can be found in Section 3; we give an informal presentation here.

Post-critically finite fractals. A *fractal* $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is generated by contractive similarities $F_1, \dots, F_N \colon \mathbb{R}^d \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$K = F(K) := \bigcup_{j=1,\dots,N} F_j(K). \tag{1.1}$$

We restrict our analysis to post-critically finite (pcf) fractals which can be approximated by a sequence of discrete graphs, such that there is a sequence of (renormalised) graph energy forms converging monotonely to an energy form on the pcf fractal (actually, we *define* the energy form of the fractal in this way).

The abstract concept of convergence of energy forms is based on *quasi-unitary equivalence*, a (quantitative) generalisation of norm resolvent convergence and unitary equivalence in the sense of Remark 2.2 (see Section 2 for further details).

Approximation by finite graphs and energy forms. Our analysis works for a class of pcf fractals (see Definition 3.2) which we call *approximable by finite graphs* (see Definition 3.5). For such a fractal K there is a sequence $(G_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ of nested graphs $G_m = (V_m, E_m)$ (i.e., $V_m \subset V_{m+1} \subset K$) such that $V_* = \bigcup_m V_m$ is dense in K, (see e.g. Figure 1 for the pentagasket with all five fixed points as boundary vertices) together

Date: April 4, 2017.



FIGURE 1. The pentagasket approximation graphs G_m starting with all five fixed points as boundary V_0 for the generations $m = 0, \dots, 3$ with $(|V_m|)_m = (5, 5 \cdot 5 - 5 = 20, 5 \cdot 20 - 5 = 95, 95 \cdot 5 - 5 = 470, \dots)$.

with a *compatible* and *self-similar* sequence of graph energies $(\mathcal{E}_m)_m$ (see Definitions 3.3 and 3.4) given by

$$\mathcal{E}_m(f) := \mathcal{E}_{G_m}(f) := \sum_{e=\{x,y\}\in E_m} c_{e,m}|f(x) - f(y)|^2 \tag{1.2}$$

for $f\colon V_m \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Here, $c_{e,m} > 0$ is the *conductance* of an edge $e \in E_m$.

The *compatibility* roughly means that $\mathcal{E}_m(\varphi)$ agrees with the energy of $\mathcal{E}_{m+1}(h)$ where $h\colon V_{m+1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is the harmonic extension of $\varphi\colon V_m \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$. The harmonic extension h has the property that it minimises the energy $\mathcal{E}_m(u)$ among all extensions $u\colon V_{m+1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with $u\restriction_{V_m} = \varphi$, see (3.1). In other words, $\mathcal{E}_m$ is the Dirichlet-to-Neumann form of the graph G_{m+1} and form $\mathcal{E}_{m+1}$, where V_m is considered as boundary of V_{m+1} (see e.g. [Ki01, Sec. 2.1] or [P16, Sec. 6.7] for this interpretation).

Self-similarity means that $\mathcal{E}_{m+1}$ can be constructed from $\mathcal{E}_m$ together with the contractive similarities and renormalisation factors defining the fractal K, see (3.3).

The existence of a compatible and self-similar sequence $(\mathcal{E}_m)_m$ (also referred to as the *renormalisation problem*) is not guaranteed for a general pcf fractal, but the class of such fractals is sufficiently large to give an interesting theory. In particular, the Sierpiński gasket, its higher-dimensional analogs, the pentagasket and the hexagasket (resp. any n-gasket if n is not divisible by 4) all belong to the class of fractals approximable by finite graphs.

The compatibility of $(\mathcal{E}_m)_m$ guarantees that the limit

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(u) := \mathcal{E}_K(u) := \lim_{m\to\infty} \mathcal{E}_m(u\restriction_{V_m})$$

exists for continuous functions $u\colon K \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ (and may be ∞). The domain of $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ consists of those continuous functions for which the limit is finite. We call the non-negative closed quadratic form $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ the *energy form* of the fractal K (and the sequence of approximating graphs $(G_m)_m$).

Measures on the fractals and approximating graphs. We fix a Borel regular probability measure μ on K having full support (e.g. a self-similar measure associating $\mu(F_j(K)) = 1/N$ to each self-similar image of K or the Kusuoka energy measure, see Subsection 5.1). On each approximating graph G_m, we define a discrete probability measure μ_m, i.e., a family $(\mu_m(x))_{x\in V_m}$ as the integral of the m-harmonic function with boundary value 1 at $x \in V_m$ and 0 at $V_m \setminus \{x\}$ (see (3.15); for a self-similar measure, $\mu_m(x)$ decays exponentially in m). We call the family $(\mu_m)_m$ of probability measures on G_m the *approximating measures* corresponding to (K, μ).

Remark. We would like to stress that the definitions of energy forms and harmonic functions on K and G_m do not refer to a measure. But once we are interested in the

corresponding operators, eigenvalues or convergence results (as explained below), we need to fix a measure μ and choose for $(\mu_m)_m$ the approximating measures corresponding to (K, μ) as above.

The associated Hilbert spaces and operators. Let $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}} = \mathsf{L}_2(K, \mu)$ and $\mathscr{H}_m = \ell_2(V_m, \mu_m)$ be the corresponding Hilbert spaces, respectively. Denote by $\widetilde{\Delta} = \Delta_{(K,\mu)}$ resp. $\Delta_m = \Delta_{(G_m,\mu_m)}$ the operators associated with the energy forms $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E}_K$ resp. $\mathcal{E}_m = \mathcal{E}_{G_m}$ in $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$ resp. $\mathscr{H}_m$. For a pcf fractal, the spectrum of $\widetilde{\Delta}$ is purely discrete and hence consists of a sequence of eigenvalues $(\lambda_k(\widetilde{\Delta}))_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ in increasing order and repeated according to the multiplicity.

We use here a variant of norm resolvent convergence for operators acting in different spaces; it follows from the concept of *quasi-unitary equivalence* of forms and will be explained in more detail in Section 2. We also give some consequences of quasi-unitary equivalence in Corollaries 1.2–1.4 below.

1.1. Main results

Our first main result is the statement that the energy forms on (G_m, μ_m) and (K, μ) are δ_m-quasi-unitary equivalent with $\delta_m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. The δ_m-quasi-unitary equivalence is formulated for quadratic forms acting in different Hilbert spaces and it implies a variant of norm resolvent convergence for the associated Laplacians. Our method does not rely on the monotonicity of the quadratic forms. It is well-known that an increasing sequence of quadratic forms on a given Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$ converges to a limit form (see e.g. [RS80, Thm. S.14]), and that the corresponding operators converge in strong resolvent sense. Here, we face a problem as the quadratic forms $\mathcal{E}_m$ act in $\mathscr{H}_m$, and they are different for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, also the limit space $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$ is different, and it is a priori not clear how to relate these spaces. We comment on other approaches like Mosco convergence of forms in Subsection 1.2.

The proof of the following first main result will be given in Subsection 4.1:

1.1. Theorem. *Let (K, μ) be a pcf fractal with Borel regular probability measure of full support approximable by finite graphs (G_m, μ_m) with corresponding approximating measures μ_m. Then the fractal energy form $\mathcal{E}_K$ and the approximating graph energy forms $\mathcal{E}_m = \mathcal{E}_{G_m}$ are δ_m-quasi-unitarily equivalent on $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}} = \mathsf{L}_2(K, \mu)$ and $\mathscr{H}_m = \ell_2(G_m, \mu_m)$, where $\delta_m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$, exponentially fast.*

For a precise formula of δ_m, see (4.3).

The definition of quasi-unitary equivalence in a simple version needs an *identification operator* $J = J_m \colon \mathscr{H}_m = \ell_2(V_m, \mu_m) \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{H}} = \mathsf{L}_2(K, \mu)$ such that a certain ("resolvent weighted") operator norm of $\mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{H}_m} - J^*J$ and $\mathrm{id}_{\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}} - JJ^*$ is bounded by δ_m, hence tends to 0, see (2.3b'). Denote by $\Delta_m \geq 0$ resp. $\widetilde{\Delta} \geq 0$ the operators associated with $\mathcal{E}_m$ resp. $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ in $\mathscr{H}_m$ resp. $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$. One also needs that $\|(\widetilde{\Delta} + 1)^{-1}J - J(\Delta_m + 1)^{-1}\|$ is small (we actually use a more elaborated version in Definition 2.1 expressed entirely in terms of the energy forms).

Let us now give some consequences of quasi-unitary equivalence of energy forms as in Theorem 1.1 (see [P12, Ch. 4], especially Thm. 4.2.14 and Thm. 4.3.5 therein).

The first consequence states that a function of the fractal operator is close to the corresponding graph operator sandwiched by J^* and J and vice versa:

1.2. Corollary. *Let $\eta\colon [0,\infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function continuous in a neighbourhood U of $\sigma(\widetilde{\Delta})$ such that $\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}(\lambda+1)^{1/2}\eta(\lambda)$ exists. Then we have*

$$\|\eta(\widetilde{\Delta}) - J\eta(\Delta_m)J^*\| \le C_\eta\delta_m \quad \text{and} \quad \|\eta(\Delta_m) - J^*\eta(\Delta)J\| \le C'_\eta\delta_m,$$

where the constants C_η and C'_η depend only on η and U.

As an example choose $\eta(\lambda) = \mathrm{e}^{-t\lambda}$, then Corollary 1.2 is about the norm convergence of the approximating heat operators on the discrete graphs to the heat operators on the fractal.

If $\eta = \mathbb{1}_I$, we conclude from Corollary 1.2:

1.3. Corollary. *If $\eta = \mathbb{1}_I$ ($\partial I \cap \sigma(\widetilde{\Delta}) = \emptyset$), then the spectral projectors converge in operator norm, i.e.,*

$$\|\mathbb{1}_I(\widetilde{\Delta}) - J\mathbb{1}_I(\Delta_m)J^*\| \le C_I\delta_m$$

where the constant depends only on I and the distance of ∂I to $\sigma(\widetilde{\Delta})$.

As in the case of usual operator norm convergence, the operator norm convergence of spectral projections as in Corollary 1.3 also implies the convergence of eigenvalues (we give a direct proof in Theorem 4.4 using the min-max characterisation of eigenvalues in Proposition 2.7). Such an eigenvalue convergence result is known as folklore, at least for fractals with self-similar measure, and where the spectral decimation method is available, but seems to be new in other cases or if the measure is not self-similar.

1.4. Corollary. *Let $\lambda_k(\Delta_m)$ resp. $\lambda_k(\widetilde{\Delta})$ be the k-th eigenvalue of Δ_m resp. $\widetilde{\Delta}$. Then*

$$\left|\lambda_k(\Delta_m) - \lambda_k(\widetilde{\Delta})\right| \le C_k\delta_m$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\dim \mathscr{H}_m \ge k$, where C_k depends only on $\lambda_k(\widetilde{\Delta})$.

In the case of purely discrete spectrum or the case of isolated eigenvalues, we can approximate an eigenfunction also in *energy norm* by a sequence of finite dimensional eigenvectors: namely, for an isolated eigenvalue $\widetilde{\lambda}$ with normalised eigenfunction $\widetilde{\Phi}$, there is a sequence $(\Phi_m)_m$ of normalised functions consisting of a linear combination of eigenfunctions with eigenvalues close to $\widetilde{\lambda}$) such that

$$\|J\Phi_m - \widetilde{\Phi}\|_{\operatorname{dom}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}} \le C_{\widetilde{\lambda}}\delta_m \tag{1.3}$$

where $C_{\widetilde{\lambda}}$ depends only on $\widetilde{\lambda}$. Here, $\|u\|^2_{\operatorname{dom}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}} = \|u\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(K,\mu)} + \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(u)$ denotes the energy norm. It follows that the convergence also holds with respect to the original Hilbert space norm of $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$. We assume here tacitly that the range of J lies in $\operatorname{dom}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$; the more general case is treated in Proposition 2.5.

1.5. Remark. We would like to stress that a result similar to Theorem 1.1 holds also for non-compact spaces such as non-compact *fractafolds*. A *fractafold* is a space which is locally homeomorphic to a given self-similar pcf fractal K (see e.g. [St03]). A non-compact example is given by $X = \bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} F^{-m}(K)$ for some pcf fractal K with IFS F, where $F^{-m}(K) = \bigcup_{w\in W_m} F_w^{-1}(K)$ for $m \ge 0$ (with the convention that F_w^{-1} is the inverse of F_w). We also let G_m be the associated m-level graph approximation (here, the vertices of G_m are included in the vertices of G_{m+1}, and each graph G_m is infinite). In particular, it follows from the abstract theory of [P12] that the entire spectrum and the essential spectrum converge. Moreover, we conclude that isolated eigenvalues and their eigenfunctions converge in the sense of (1.3) (see again Proposition 2.5 for the precise statement).

1.2. Previous works and further developments

In [Sh96] the method of *spectral decimation* is described for the first time. Roughly, with this method one can calculate the eigenvalues of generation $m+1$ from generation m by the preimage of some rational function. From the spectral decimation method, one can also conclude the convergence of eigenvalues, cf. [Sh96, Sec. 3.1]. This method is restricted to certain fractals, and works only for the self-similar measure. Our method works for *any* Borel regular probability measure of full support.

Mosco [M94] developed a notion of convergence of energy forms, nowadays called "Mosco convergence" which is equivalent with strong resolvent convergence. Kuwae and Shioya [KuS03, Sec. 2, esp. Sec. 2.5] extended the notion of Mosco convergence to the case of varying Hilbert spaces. In [HT15], there is a quite general approach how (separable) Dirichlet forms can be approximated by Dirichlet forms on finite spaces such that the corresponding forms converge in the sense of Mosco. We will relate Mosco convergence and our generalised norm resolvent convergence in a subsequent publication.

In [IPR$^+$10] the resolvent for the Neumann resp. Dirichlet Laplacian is calculated for pcf self-similar fractals K. The Neumann Laplacian is the operator associated with $\mathcal{E}_K$, while the Dirichlet Laplacian is the operator associated with $\mathcal{E}_K^{\mathrm{D}} := \mathcal{E}_K\restriction_{\{\,u\in\operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K\,|\,u\restriction_{V_0}=0\,\}}$.

Our approach only needs the existence of a sequence of graphs and energy forms converging in a suitable sense to the limit space and limit energy form. In particular, the self-similar structure of our fractal is not really essential for the proof of Theorem 1.1, and one can extend our results to certain finitely ramified fractals as introduced in [T08] (see also Remark 4.2).

For numerical calculations of spectra, an adaption of the finite element method (FEM) has been used also for fractals, e.g. in [GRSt01, ASStT03]. We comment on this approach in Remark 4.3. Moreover, the conditions we have to check for the quasi-unitary equivalence has been appeared already in the literature in the context of the FEM. For example, let $P_m u$ be the piecewise harmonic interpolation spline (using the terminology of Strichartz et al [StU00, GRSt01]), i.e., the function with values $u(x)$ for $x \in V_m$ and being m-harmonic on K. Then $P_m u = JJ'^1$ in our terminology of Subsection 4.1. Moreover, the estimate

$$\|u - P_m u\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(K,\mu)} \le \frac{r_0}{N}\mathcal{E}_K(u)$$

for $u \in \operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K$ for symmetric fractals (with common energy renormalisation factor $r_0 \in (0,1)$) appearing in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Subsection 4.1 is already shown in [GRSt01, Thm. 3.4].

We will apply the concept of quasi-unitary equivalence also to the case of "graph-like" spaces such as metric graphs and graph-like manifolds in a second publication [PS17]. We will show that under suitable assumptions, a fractal energy form can be approximated by a suitably renormalised energy form on a family of metric graphs or graph-like spaces. This will complement some numerical results of "outer" approximations resp. approximations of fractals by open domains with their natural Neumann Laplacians as discussed e.g. in [BStU08, pp 50–51, Fig.14-15] and [BHSt09].

1.3. Structure of the article

Section 3 contains a brief introduction to pcf fractals in the way we need it. In Section 5 we present some examples. Section 4 contains the proofs of our main results. In Section 2, we give a brief review of the abstract convergence result for energy forms in different Hilbert spaces.

1.4. Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Michael Hinz for helpful comments on the manuscript and literature.

2. An abstract norm resolvent convergence result

2.1. Quasi-unitary equivalence

In this section, we define a sort of "distance" between two operators Δ and $\widetilde{\Delta}$ defined via energy forms $\mathcal{E}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$, which act in different Hilbert spaces $\mathscr{H}$ and $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$, respectively. The general theory is developed in great detail in [P12, Ch. 4]. The concept of quasi-unitary equivalence assures a *generalised* norm resolvent convergence for operators $\Delta = \Delta_m$ converging to $\widetilde{\Delta}$ as $m \to \infty$. Each operator Δ_m acts in a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}_m$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$; and the Hilbert spaces are allowed to depend on m.

In our application, the Hilbert spaces $\mathscr{H}_m$ are functions on the vertices V_m of a weighted graph (G_m, μ_m), namely $\ell_2(V_m, \mu_m)$. Moreover, the "limit" metric measure space is (X, μ) with Hilbert space $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}} = \mathsf{L}_2(X, \mu)$.[1]

In order to define the convergence, we define a sort of "distance" δ_m between $\Delta := \Delta_m := \Delta_{(G_m,\mu_m)}$ and $\widetilde{\Delta} := \Delta_{(K,\mu)}$, in the sense that if $\delta_m \to 0$ then Δ_m converges to $\widetilde{\Delta}$ in the above-mentioned generalised norm resolvent convergence. We start now with the general concept:

Let $\mathscr{H}$ and $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$ be two separable Hilbert spaces. We say that $(\mathcal{E}, \mathscr{H}^1)$ is an *energy form in* $\mathscr{H}$ if $\mathcal{E}$ is a closed, non-negative quadratic form in $\mathscr{H}$, i.e., if $\mathcal{E}(f) := \mathcal{E}(f, f)$ for some sesquilinear form $\mathcal{E}\colon \mathscr{H}^1 \times \mathscr{H}^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, denoted by the same symbol, if $\mathcal{E}(f) \geq 0$ and if $\mathscr{H}^1 := \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{E}$, endowed with the norm defined by

$$\|f\|_1^2 := \|f\|_{\mathscr{H}^1}^2 := \|f\|_{\mathscr{H}}^2 + \mathcal{E}(f), \tag{2.1}$$

is itself a Hilbert space and dense (as a set) in $\mathscr{H}$. We call the corresponding non-negative, self-adjoint operator Δ (see e.g. [K66, Sec. VI.2]) the *energy operator* associated with $(\mathcal{E}, \mathscr{H}^1)$. Similarly, let $(\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}, \widetilde{\mathscr{H}^1})$ be an energy form in $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$ with energy operator $\widetilde{\Delta}$.

Associated with an energy operator Δ, we introduce a natural *scale of Hilbert spaces* $\mathscr{H}^k$ defined via the *abstract Sobolev norms*

$$\|f\|_{\mathscr{H}^k} := \|f\|_k := \|(\Delta + 1)^{k/2} f\|. \tag{2.2}$$

Then $\mathscr{H}^k = \operatorname{dom} \Delta^{k/2}$ if $k \geq 0$ and $\mathscr{H}^k$ is the completion of $\mathscr{H} = \mathscr{H}^0$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_k$ for $k < 0$. Obviously, the scale of Hilbert spaces for $k = 1$ and its associated norm agrees with $\mathscr{H}^1$ and $\|\cdot\|_1$ defined above (see [P12, Sec. 3.2] for details). Similarly, we denote by $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}^k}$ the scale of Hilbert spaces associated with $\widetilde{\Delta}$.

We now need pairs of so-called *identification operators* acting on the Hilbert spaces and later also pairs of identification operators acting on the form domains.

2.1. Definition. Let $\delta \geq 0$, and let $J\colon \mathscr{H} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$ and $J'\colon \widetilde{\mathscr{H}} \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}$, resp. $J^1\colon \mathscr{H}^1 \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{H}^1}$ and $J'^1\colon \widetilde{\mathscr{H}^1} \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}^1$ be bounded linear operators on the Hilbert spaces and energy form domains.

[1] It is a question of interpretation, which object is simpler and which one wants to approximate. In the first application of the concept of quasi-unitary equivalence, the space $\mathscr{H}$ was the limit space, the L_2-space over a metric graph, while $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$ was based on a family of shrinking ("graph-like") manifolds.

(i) We say that J is *δ-quasi-unitary* with *δ-quasi-adjoint* J' if

$$\|Jf\| \le (1+\delta)\|f\|, \qquad \big|\langle Jf,u\rangle - \langle f,J'u\rangle\big| \le \delta\|f\|\|u\| \qquad (f\in\mathscr{H}, u\in\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}), \tag{2.3a}$$

$$\|f - J'Jf\| \le \delta\|f\|_1, \qquad \|u - JJ'u\| \le \delta\|u\|_1 \qquad (f\in\mathscr{H}^1, u\in\widetilde{\mathscr{H}^1}). \tag{2.3b}$$

(ii) We say that J^1 and J'^1 are *δ-compatible* with the identification operators J and J' if

$$\|J^1 f - Jf\| \le \delta\|f\|_1, \quad \|J'^1 u - J'u\| \le \delta\|u\|_1 \qquad (f\in\mathscr{H}^1, u\in\widetilde{\mathscr{H}^1}). \tag{2.3c}$$

(iii) We say that the energy forms $\mathcal{E}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ are *δ-close* if

$$\big|\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(J^1 f,u) - \mathcal{E}(f,J'^1 u)\big| \le \delta\|f\|_1\|u\|_1 \qquad (f\in\mathscr{H}^1, u\in\widetilde{\mathscr{H}^1}). \tag{2.3d}$$

(iv) We say that $\mathcal{E}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ are *δ-quasi unitarily equivalent* (on $\mathscr{H}$ and $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$), if (2.3a)–(2.3d) are fulfilled, i.e.,

- if there exists identification operators J and J' such that J is δ-quasi unitary with δ-adjoint J' (i.e., (2.3a)–(2.3b) hold);
- if there exists identification operators J^1 and J'^1 which are δ-compatible with J and J' (i.e., (2.3c) holds);
- and if $\mathcal{E}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ are δ-close (i.e., (2.3d) holds).

In operator norm notation, δ-quasi unitary equivalence means

$$\|J\| \le 1+\delta, \qquad \|J^* - J'\| \le \delta \tag{2.3a'}$$

$$\|(\mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{H}} - J'J)R^{1/2}\| \le \delta, \qquad \|(\mathrm{id}_{\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}} - JJ')\widetilde{R}^{1/2}\| \le \delta, \tag{2.3b'}$$

$$\|(J^1 - J)R^{1/2}\| \le \delta, \qquad \|(J'^1 - J')\widetilde{R}^{1/2}\| \le \delta, \tag{2.3c'}$$

$$\|\widetilde{R}^{1/2}(\widetilde{\Delta}J^1 - J^{-1}\Delta)R^{1/2}\| \le \delta, \tag{2.3d'}$$

where $R \coloneqq (\Delta+1)^{-1}$ resp. $\widetilde{R} \coloneqq (\widetilde{\Delta}+1)^{-1}$ denotes the resolvent of Δ resp. $\widetilde{\Delta}$ in -1. Let $J^{-1} \coloneqq (J'^1)^*\colon \mathscr{H}^{-1} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{H}}^{-1}$, where $(\cdot)^*$ denotes here the dual map with respect to the dual pairing $\mathscr{H}^1 \times \mathscr{H}^{-1}$ induced by the inner product on $\mathscr{H}$ and similarly on $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$ (J^{-1} should not be confused with an inverse!). Moreover, Δ is interpreted as $\Delta\colon \mathscr{H}^1 \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}^{-1}$, and similarly for $\widetilde{\Delta}$.

2.2. Remark. Let us state some trivial consequences, explaining the notation in two extreme cases:

(i) *"δ-quasi unitary equivalence" is a quantitative generalisation of "unitary equivalence":*

Note that if $\delta = 0$, J is 0-quasi unitary if and only if J is unitary with $J^* = J'$. Moreover, $\mathcal{E}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ are 0-quasi unitarily equivalent if and only if Δ and $\widetilde{\Delta}$ are unitarily equivalent (in the sense that $JR = \widetilde{R}J$).

(ii) *"δ_m-quasi unitary equivalence" is a generalisation of "norm resolvent convergence":* If $\mathscr{H} = \widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$, $J = J' = \mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{H}}$, then the first two conditions (2.3a)–(2.3b) are trivially fulfilled with $\delta = 0$. Moreover, if $\Delta = \Delta_m$ and $\delta = \delta_m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$, then $\widetilde{\Delta}$ and Δ_m are δ_m-quasi unitarily equivalent if and only if $\|R_m - \widetilde{R}\| \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$, i.e., if Δ_m *converges* to $\widetilde{\Delta}$ *in norm resolvent sense.*

2.2. Consequences of quasi-unitary equivalence

It will be convenient in our case to show the following:

2.3. Lemma. *Assume that* (2.3a) *is fulfilled with* $\delta_{\mathrm{a}} > 0$ *and* (2.3c) *with* $\delta_{\mathrm{c}} > 0$. *If*

$$\|u - JJ'^1 u\| \leq \delta' \|u\|_1 \qquad (u \in \widetilde{\mathscr{H}}^1) \tag{2.4}$$

holds, then the second inequality in (2.3b) *is fulfilled with* $\delta = \delta' + (1+\delta_{\mathrm{a}})\delta_{\mathrm{c}}$.

In particular, if all conditions (2.3) *are fulfilled for some* $\delta > 0$, *except for the second one in* (2.3b) *which is replaced by* (2.4) *(with* δ' *replaced by* δ*), then* $\mathcal{E}$ *and* $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ *are* $\widetilde{\delta}$*-quasi-unitarily equivalent with* $\widetilde{\delta} = 2\delta + \delta^2$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u - JJ'u\| &\leq \|u - JJ'^1 u\| + \|J(J'^1 - J')u\| \\ &\leq \|u - JJ'^1 u\| + \|J\|\|(J'^1 - J')u\| \leq \big(\delta' + (1+\delta_{\mathrm{a}})\delta_{\mathrm{c}}\big)\|u\|_1\end{aligned}$$

and if $\delta', \delta_{\mathrm{a}}, \delta_{\mathrm{c}} \leq \delta$, then the error estimate is greater or equal to $2\delta + \delta^2$, as claimed. □

Let us mention some consequences of the above-mentioned quasi-unitary equivalence we need in the proof of Proposition 2.5:

2.4. Proposition (see [P12, Ch. 4])**.** *Let* $\eta\colon [0,\infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ *be a function continuous in a neighbourhood* U *of* $\sigma(\widetilde{\Delta})$ *such that* $\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}(\lambda+1)^{1/2}\eta(\lambda)$ *exists. Then we have*

$$\|J'\eta(\widetilde{\Delta}) - \eta(\Delta)J'\| \leq C_\eta \delta, \tag{2.5a}$$

$$\big|\|J'u\| - \|u\|\big| \leq 3\delta\|u\|_1 \tag{2.5b}$$

$$\|J^1\eta(\Delta) - \eta(\widetilde{\Delta})J^{-1}\|_{-1\to 1} \leq C_\eta\delta \tag{2.5c}$$

for any pair of δ*-quasi-unitarily equivalent energy forms* $\mathcal{E}$ *and* $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ *with associated operators* Δ *and* $\widetilde{\Delta}$, *where* C_η *depends only on* η *and* U.

Here, we use the notation $\|A\|_{-1\to 1} = \|(\widetilde{\Delta}+1)^{1/2}A(\Delta+1)^{1/2}\|$ for $A\colon \mathscr{H}^{-1} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{H}}^1$. An inequality similar to (2.5b) is proven in (2.10) in a more specific situation.

2.5. Proposition. *Let* $\mathcal{E}$ *and* $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ *be two* δ*-quasi-unitarily equivalent energy forms with associated operators* Δ *and* $\widetilde{\Delta}$. *Assume that* $\widetilde{\Phi}$ *is an eigenvector of* $\widetilde{\Delta}$, *such that its eigenvalue* $\widetilde{\lambda}$ *is discrete in* $\sigma(\widetilde{\Delta})$, *i.e., there is an open disc* D *in* $\mathbb{C}$ *such that* $\sigma(\widetilde{\Delta}) \cap D = \{\widetilde{\lambda}\}$. *Then there exists a normalised eigenvector* Φ *of* Δ *with* $\Phi \in \operatorname{ran} \mathbb{1}_D(\Delta)$ *and a universal constant* C *depending only on* $\widetilde{\lambda}$ *(and the radius of* D*) such that*

$$\|J^1\Phi - \widetilde{\Phi}\|_1 \leq C\delta.$$

Note that the eigenvalue $\widetilde{\lambda}$ does not necessarily need to have finite multiplicity.

Proof. Set $P := \mathbb{1}_D(\Delta)$ and $\widetilde{P} := \mathbb{1}_D(\widetilde{\Delta})$. Note that $\operatorname{ran} P$ may consist of the linear combination of several eigenvectors if $\widetilde{\lambda}$ is not a simple eigenvalue. We have

$$\|PJ'\widetilde{\Phi}\| \geq \|J'\widetilde{P}\widetilde{\Phi}\| - \|(PJ' - J'\widetilde{P})\widetilde{\Phi}\| \geq \|J'\widetilde{\Phi}\| - C_\eta\delta\|\widetilde{\Phi}\| \geq 1 - \underbrace{\big(3(\widetilde{\lambda}+1)^{1/2} + C_\eta\big)}_{=:C_1}\delta$$

by (2.5a) with $\eta = \mathbb{1}_D$ and (2.5b) and similarly,

$$\|PJ'\widetilde{\Phi}\| \leq \|J'\widetilde{P}\widetilde{\Phi}\| + \|(PJ' - J'\widetilde{P})\widetilde{\Phi}\| \leq \|J'\widetilde{\Phi}\| + C_\eta\delta\|\widetilde{\Phi}\| \leq 1 + C_1\delta,$$

and therefore

$$\big|\|PJ'\widetilde{\Phi}\| - 1\big| \leq C_1\delta. \tag{2.6}$$

In particular, $\|PJ'\widetilde{\Phi}\| > 0$ for δ small enough. Let

$$\Phi := \frac{1}{\|PJ'\widetilde{\Phi}\|} PJ'\widetilde{\Phi},$$

then $\Phi \in \mathscr{H}^1$ and for $\delta < 1/C_1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|J^1\Phi - \widetilde{\Phi}\|_1 &= \Big\| \frac{1}{\|PJ'\widetilde{\Phi}\|} J^1 PJ'\widetilde{\Phi} - \widetilde{\Phi} \Big\|_1 \\
&\le \frac{1}{\|PJ'\widetilde{\Phi}\|} \Big(\big\|(J^1P - \widetilde{P}J^{-1})J'\widetilde{\Phi}\big\|_1 + \big\|\widetilde{P}(J^{-1}J'\widetilde{\Phi} - \widetilde{\Phi})\big\|_1 \\
&\qquad\qquad + \big|1 - \|PJ'\widetilde{\Phi}\|\big| \|\widetilde{\Phi}\|_1 \Big) \\
&\le \frac{1}{1 - C_1\delta} \Big(C_\eta \delta \|\widetilde{\Phi}\|_{-1} + (\widetilde{\lambda} + 1) \big\|J^{-1}J' - \mathrm{id}\big\|_{0\to -1} \|\widetilde{\Phi}\|_1 + C_1\delta \|\widetilde{\Phi}\|_1 \Big) \\
&\le \frac{1}{1 - C_1\delta} \big(C_\eta + (\widetilde{\lambda} + 1)^{3/2} C'' + C_1 (\widetilde{\lambda} + 1)^{1/2} \big) \delta
\end{aligned}$$

using (2.5c), $\|\widetilde{P}\|_{-1\to 1} = 1 + \widetilde{\lambda}$ and (2.6) for the second inequality, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\big\|J^{-1}J' - \mathrm{id}\big\|_{0\to -1} = \big\|(J')^* J'^1 - \mathrm{id}\big\|_{1\to 0} &\le \|(J')^* - J\| \, \|J'^1\|_{1\to 0} + \|JJ'^1 - \mathrm{id}\|_{1\to 0} \\
&\le \delta(1 + \delta) + \delta' \le (1 + 1/C_1 + C')\delta \le C''\delta
\end{aligned}$$

using also $\|J'^1\|_{1\to 0} \le 1 + \delta \le 1 + 1/C_1$: it can be seen as in Lemma 2.3 that $\delta' \le C'\delta$ for some constant $C' > 0$. □

2.3. Some eigenvalue estimates

For problems with purely discrete spectrum, we also cite some results (see [P12, Prp. 4.4.18] for the most general version) dealing directly with eigenvalue estimates, using the min-max principle: Here, λ_k denotes the k-th eigenvalue of the operator associated with $\mathcal{E}$, in increasing order and repeated according to their multiplicity.

2.6. Proposition. *Assume that we have a first order identification operator*

$$J^1 \colon \mathscr{H}^1 \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{H}^1}$$

such that there exist $\delta_0 \ge 0$ *and* $\delta_1 \ge 0$ *with*

$$\|J^1 f\|^2 \ge \|f\|^2 - \delta_0 \|f\|^2 - \delta_1 \mathcal{E}(f) \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(J^1 f) \le \mathcal{E}(f) \tag{2.7}$$

for all $f \in \mathscr{H}^1$. *If* $\delta_0 + \delta_1\lambda_k < 1$ *then*

$$\widetilde{\lambda}_k \le \frac{1}{1 - \delta_0 - \delta_1\lambda_k} \cdot \lambda_k \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{1 - \delta_0}{1 + \delta_1 \widetilde{\lambda}_k} \cdot \widetilde{\lambda}_k \le \lambda_k \tag{2.8}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

If we have shown quasi-unitary equivalence and one additional assumption, then we can conclude from the last proposition (again slightly adopted to our application in Section 4 in order to get an optimal estimate):

2.7. Proposition. *Assume that* $\mathcal{E}$ *and* $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ *are* δ*-quasi-unitarily equivalent (with* (2.3a) *and* (2.3d) *fulfilled with* $\delta = 0$ *and* (2.3b) *and* (2.3c) *with* $\|f\|_1$ *resp.* $\|u\|_1$ *replaced by* $\mathcal{E}(f)^{1/2}$ *resp.* $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(u)^{1/2}$*) and that*

$$\mathcal{E}(f, J'^1 J^1 f - f) \le 0 \tag{2.9a}$$

for all $f \in \mathscr{H}^1$, then (2.8) *is fulfilled with $\delta_0 = \delta_1 = \delta$. Moreover, if*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(u, J^1 J'^1 u - u) \le 0 \tag{2.9b}$$

for all $u \in \widetilde{\mathscr{H}^1}$, then

$$\lambda_k \le \frac{1}{1-\delta(1+\widetilde{\lambda}_k)} \cdot \widetilde{\lambda}_k \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta\lambda_k} \cdot \lambda_k \le \widetilde{\lambda}_k. \tag{2.9c}$$

Proof. We first estimate

$$\big|\|Jf\| - \|f\|\big| = \frac{\big|\|Jf\|^2 - \|f\|^2\big|}{\|Jf\| + \|f\|} = \frac{\big|\langle J^*Jf - f, f\rangle\big|}{\|Jf\| + \|f\|} \overset{\text{CS}}{\le} \frac{\delta\mathcal{E}(f)^{1/2}\|f\|}{\|f\|} = \delta\mathcal{E}(f)^{1/2} \tag{2.10}$$

for $f \in \mathscr{H}^1$ using (2.3b); this implies

$$\|J^1 f\| - \|f\| \ge \big(\|Jf\| - \|f\|\big) - \|(J - J^1)f\| \ge -2\delta\mathcal{E}(f)^{1/2}$$

using the previous estimate and (2.3c). We conclude that

$$\|J^1 f\|^2 - \|f\|^2 = \big(\|J^1 f\| - \|f\|\big)\big(\|J^1 f\| + \|f\|\big) \ge -2\delta\mathcal{E}(f)^{1/2}\|f\| \overset{\text{CY}}{\ge} -\delta\big(\|f\|^2 + \mathcal{E}(f)\big).$$

For the energy forms, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(J^1 f) - \mathcal{E}(f) = \big(\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(J^1 f, J^1 f) - \mathcal{E}(f, J'^1 J^1 f)\big) + \mathcal{E}(f, J'^1 J^1 f - f) \le 0$$

using (2.3d) (with $\delta = 0$) and (2.9a). The result follows now from Proposition 2.6.

The second estimate can be seen similarly by swapping $\mathcal{E}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$, using the identification operators in the opposite direction and (2.9b) □

3. Post-critically finite fractals and self-similar energy forms

In this section, we briefly review some facts on fractals and self-similar energy forms, see [Ki01] or [St06, Ch. 4]. Let (X, d) be a complete metric space. Typically, we work with $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ with the Euclidean metric (see Section 5), but our abstract convergence results also hold in the general case.

3.1. Post-critically finite fractals and their approximating graphs

We start with a finite family $F = (F_j)_{j=1,\dots,N}$ of contractive similarities $F_j \colon X \longrightarrow X$, i.e.,

$$d(F_j(x), F_j(y)) = \theta_j d(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$, where $\theta_j \in (0, 1)$ denotes the *contraction ratio*. By the Banach fixed point theorem, a similarity has a unique *fixed point* $q_j \in X$. The family F is called an *iterated function system (IFS)*.

For any IFS, there exists a unique (non-empty) compact subset $K \subset X$, called *self-similar set* or *self-similar fractal*, such that K is self-similar with respect to F, i.e., such that

$$K = F(K) := \bigcup_{j=1}^{N} F_j(K).$$

The existence is guaranteed by Banach's fixed point theorem on the space of compact subsets of X with Hausdorff distance, namely we have (see [Ki01, Thm. 1.1.7]):

3.1. Proposition. *Let $K \subset X$ be a compact fractal associated with an IFS F. Moreover, let X_0 be a non-empty compact subset of X. Define recursively $X_{m+1} := F(X_m)$ as the image of the IFS. Then $(X_m)_m$ converges to K in Hausdorff distance exponentially fast.*

For a word $w = w_1 \dots w_m$ of length $|w| = m$ over the alphabet $\{1, \dots, N\}$ we define the map F_w by $F_w = F_{w_1} \circ \dots \circ F_{w_m}$. We denote by $W_m = \{1, \dots, N\}^m$ the set of all words of length m. Then there is a natural cell structure on the self-similar set K described by the map $W_m \ni w \mapsto K_w := F_w(K)$ and we call $K_w := F_w(K)$ an *m-cell*.

3.2. Definition. We say that a self-similar compact set K is *post-critically finite* (or *pcf* for short) if K is connected, and if there exists a finite set $V_0 \subset K$, called the *boundary* of K, such that

$$F_w(K) \cap F_{w'}(K) \subset F_w(V_0) \cap F_{w'}(V_0)$$

for all words w, w' ($w \neq w'$) of the same length. Moreover, we assume that each boundary point is a fixed point of the IFS, i.e., that $V_0 \subset \{q_1, \dots, q_N\}$.

In other words, on a pcf fractal, its m-cells intersect only in the corresponding m-cell boundary points, hence in a finite set of at most N elements. Note that the choice of V_0 among the fixed points of the IFS is not unique. Note also that V_0 is *not* the topological boundary of K in X (in fact, K is its own boundary as subset of X).

For $m = 0$, we let $G_0 = (V_0, E_0)$ be the complete graph. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by

$$V_m := \bigcup_{w \in W_m} F_w(V_0)$$

the union of all *m-cell boundary points* and V_0. We consider V_m as the vertex set of a graph G_m with edges

$$E_m := \big\{ \{x, y\} \subset V_m \,\big|\, x \neq y \text{ and there is } w \in W_m \text{ such that } x, y \in F_w(V_0) \big\}$$

(recall that G_0 is the complete graph, hence any pair of different vertices in V_0 is connected). We also write $x \sim_m y$ if $\{x, y\} \in E_m$. We call $x \in V_m$ a *junction point* if x lies in more than one m-cell. It is clear that once, the IFS and the graph $G_0 = (V_0, E_0)$ at level $m = 0$ are given (in our case the complete graph), the sequence of graphs $G_m = (V_m, E_m)$ is recursively defined. We call $(G_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ the *approximating graph sequence* associated with the self-similar set K and its boundary V_0.

We can rephrase the above by saying that each word $w \in W_m$ acts on the graph G_m as injective graph homomorphism $F_w \colon G_0 \longrightarrow G_m$ (i.e., there are maps $F_w \colon V_0 \longrightarrow V_m$ and $F_w \colon E_0 \longrightarrow E_m$, all denoted by the same symbol F_w, such that if $F_w(x_0) = x$ and $F_w(y_0) = y$ then $F_w(\{x_0, y_0\}) = \{x, y\}$).

Note that the "address" w of a vertex $x \in V_m$ (i.e., the word $w \in W_m$ and the vertex $x_0 \in V_0$ with $x = F_w(x_0)$) is not necessarily unique. Nevertheless, every edge $e = \{x, y\} \in E_m$ has a unique "address" $w \in W_m$ and $e_0 \in E_0$ with $e = F_w(e_0)$, as two vertices joined by an edge are contained in the boundary of a unique m-cell, namely in $F_w(V_0)$.

3.2. Energy forms on the approximating graphs

Associated with the graph G_m is its *energy*, given by the quadratic form

$$\mathcal{E}_{G_m}(f) = \sum_{\{x,y\} \in E_m} c_{\{x,y\},m} |f(x) - f(y)|^2$$

for functions $f \in \ell(V_m) := \{f \colon V_m \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}\}$; we specify the *conductances* $c_{\{x,y\},m} > 0$ whenever $x \sim_m y$ later on.

3.3. Definition ([Ki01, Def. 2.2.1])**.** We say that a sequence $(\mathcal{E}_{G_m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ of energy forms on a sequence of graphs $(G_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is *compatible*, if the vertex sets of G_m are nested (i.e.,

$V_m \subset V_{m+1}$) and if

$$\mathcal{E}_{G_m}(\varphi) = \min\{\, \mathcal{E}_{G_{m+1}}(f) \,\big|\, f \in \ell(V_{m+1}),\ f\restriction_{V_m} = \varphi \,\} \tag{3.1}$$

for all $\varphi \in \ell(V_m)$.

Remark.

(i) The right hand side of (3.1) can be seen as a Dirichlet-to-Neumann form of the graph V_{m+1} with boundary V_m; compatibility then means that the $(m+1)$-th Dirichlet-to-Neumann form actually agrees with the m-th graph energy $\mathcal{E}_{G_m}$.

(ii) The minimiser $h_{m+1} \in \ell(V_{m+1})$ of (3.1) is unique, called *harmonic extension* of $\varphi \in \ell(V_m)$.

For a compatible sequence $(\mathcal{E}_{G_m})_m$ we can define a limit form (see [Ki01, Sec. 2.2]). Let $V_* := \bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0} V_m$ and $u \in \ell(V_*)$. As $u\restriction_{V_{m+1}}$ is an extension of $u\restriction_{V_m}$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{G_m}(u\restriction_{V_m}) \le \mathcal{E}_{G_{m+1}}(u\restriction_{V_{m+1}})$$

by (3.1), hence

$$\mathcal{E}_K(u) := \lim_{m\to\infty} \mathcal{E}_{G_m}(u\restriction_{V_m}) \tag{3.2}$$

exists (and may be ∞).

3.4. Definition. Let $(G_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ be the approximating sequence of graphs associated with the IFS $(F_j)_{j=1,\dots,N}$, the corresponding self-similar set K and its boundary V_0. We call a sequence $(\mathcal{E}_{G_m})_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ of energy forms on $(G_m)_m$ *self-similar* if there exist so-called *renormalisation factors* $r_j \in (0,1)$ for $j = 1,\dots,N$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}_{G_{m+1}}(u) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} r_j^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{G_m}(u \circ F_j) \tag{3.3}$$

for $u \in \ell(V_{m+1})$.

Clearly, a self-similar sequence $(\mathcal{E}_{G_m})_m$ can be defined recursively, given $\mathcal{E}_{G_0}$ on $\ell(V_0)$ by (3.3). As a result, we then obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_{G_m}(u) = \sum_{w\in W_m} r_w^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{G_0}(u \circ F_w) \tag{3.4}$$

where $r_w := r_{w_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot r_{w_m}$. In particular, the conductances are given by

$$c_{e,m} = \frac{c_{e_0,0}}{r_w} \in \big[c_{-,m}, c_{+,m}\big] \quad \text{with} \quad c_{\pm,m} := \frac{c_{\pm,0}}{(r_\mp)^m}, \tag{3.5}$$

where $w \in W_m$ is given by $e = F_w(e_0)$ (recall that $w \in W$ and e_0 are uniquely determined by $e \in E_m$, see above). Moreover, $r_\pm$ is the maximal resp. minimal value of the renormalisation factors $r_1,\dots,r_N$, and similarly $c_{\pm,0}$ is the maximal resp. minimal value of the conductances $c_{e_0,0}$ of $\mathcal{E}_{G_0}$.

We now make our main assumption on the fractal:

3.5. Definition. We say that a fractal K is *approximable by finite graphs*, if K is a self-similar set given by an IFS, if there is an approximating sequence of graphs $(G_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}$, and if there is a *compatible and self-similar* sequence $(\mathcal{E}_{G_m})_m$ of energy forms $\mathcal{E}_{G_m}$ on G_m. We call V_0 (i.e., the vertex set of the graph G_0) the *boundary of* K.

On a fractal K approximable by finite graphs, there exists a natural energy form $\mathcal{E}_K$ defined by (3.2). Note that such a fractal is uniquely determined by the data $((F_j)_{j=1,\dots,N}, (r_j)_{j=1,\dots,N}, \mathcal{E}_{G_0})$.

The pcf property guarantees the existence of the approximating sequence of graphs. Moreover, given an energy form $\mathcal{E}_{G_0}$ and renormalisation factors $r_1,\dots,r_N$, one can

define a self-similar sequence of energy forms $(\mathcal{E}_{G_m})_m$ by (3.4). The difficult problem is to find $\mathcal{E}_{G_0}$ (i.e., conductances $(c_{e_0,0})_{e_0\in E_0}$) and $r_1,\dots,r_N$ such that $(\mathcal{E}_{G_m})_m$ is at the same time *compatible*. This problem is called the *renormalisation problem*, and can be rephrased as a fixed point problem or a non-linear eigenvalue problem. It can be shown (see e.g. [Ki01, Prop. 3.1.3]) that $(\mathcal{E}_{G_m})_m$ defined via (3.4) is compatible if and only if it is compatible at level $m=0$ (i.e., (3.1) holds for $m=0$). The renormalisation problem is not (yet) solved for general pcf fractals (see e.g. [St06, Sec.4.2, p. 98f]), but there are many examples (see Section 5).

3.3. The energy form on the fractal

Given now a fractal K approximable by finite graphs, we can define a limit form $\mathcal{E}_K$ as in (3.2) and the self-similarity (3.3) survives the limit: $\mathcal{E}_K$ is *self-similar*, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{E}_K(u)=\sum_{j=1}^{N} r_j^{-1}\mathcal{E}_K(u\circ F_j) \tag{3.6}$$

holds for all $u\in\ell(V_*)$. Let now $\mathcal{E}_K$ be the form defined in (3.2) on

$$\operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K := \{\, u\in \mathsf{C}(K)\,|\,\mathcal{E}_K(u):=\lim_{m\to\infty}\mathcal{E}_{G_m}(u{\restriction}_{V_m})<\infty\,\}.$$

As $V_*=\bigcup_m V_m$ is dense in K, a continuous function on K is indeed uniformly continuous, hence determined by its values on the dense set V_* (see [Ki01, Thm. 3.3.4] using the fact that $r_j\in(0,1)$ and (3.12)).

The compatibility of the sequence $(\mathcal{E}_{G_m})_m$ now passes over to the limit in the following sense (see [Ki01, Lem. 2.2.2]): for any "boundary value" $\varphi\in\ell(V_m)$ there exists a unique continuous function $h\in\operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K$ on K such that $h{\restriction}_{V_m}=\varphi$ and

$$\mathcal{E}_{G_m}(\varphi)=\mathcal{E}_K(h)=\min\big\{\,\mathcal{E}_K(u)\,\big|\,u\in\operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K, u{\restriction}_{V_m}=\varphi\,\big\}. \tag{3.7}$$

These functions are called *m-harmonic functions*. In the special case where φ is the characteristic function $\mathbb{1}_x$ of the set $\{x\}$ for $x\in V_m$ we denote the m-harmonic function with boundary value $\mathbb{1}_x$ by $\psi_{x,m}$. By polarisation and a simple argument, it follows for the corresponding sesquilinear forms that

$$\mathcal{E}_K(h,u)=\mathcal{E}_{G_m}(h{\restriction}_{V_m},u{\restriction}_{V_m}) \tag{3.8}$$

for all $u\in\operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K$ and $h\in\operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K$ an m-harmonic function.

We need the following "localisation" of the energy form $\mathcal{E}_K$ on the fractal (see also [T08, Sec. 3]):

3.6. Proposition. *Let K be a fractal approximable by finite graphs with self-similar energy form $\mathcal{E}_K$ and let $m\in\mathbb{N}_0$. Then there is an energy form $\mathcal{E}_{K_w}$ with $\operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_{K_w}=\{\,u{\restriction}_{K_w}\,|\,u\in\operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K\,\}$ for each m-cell K_w ($w\in W_m$) such that*

$$\mathcal{E}_K(u)=\sum_{w\in W_m}\mathcal{E}_{K_w}(u{\restriction}_{K_w}) \tag{3.9}$$

for all $u\in\operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K$.

We call $\mathcal{E}_{K_w}$ the *localised* energy form on the m-cell K_w.

Remark.

(i) We would like to emphasise that we have two formulas with a sum over $w\in W_m$, namely (3.9) and

$$\mathcal{E}(u)=\sum_{w\in W_m} r_w^{-1}\mathcal{E}_K(u\circ F_w)$$

by recursively applying (3.6). In the first one, $\mathcal{E}_{K_w}$ is the energy of the restriction of u to K_w, while in the second one, $\mathcal{E}_K \circ F_w$ is an image of u scaled down to the cell K_w, and hence needs the renormalisation factor.

(ii) The fractal K can also be viewed as being glued together from K_w for $w \in W_m$ according to the graph where we consider $w \in W_m$ as vertices and $w' \sim w$ being joint by an edge if $F_w(K) \cap F_{w'}(K)$ is non-empty. We have treated such abstract spaces coupled by graphs in [P17].

Proof of Proposition 3.6. As $K_w = F_w(K)$ is itself a self-similar pcf fractal with IFS $(F_j \circ F_w)_{j=1,\dots,N}$, we can just define $\mathcal{E}_{K_w}$ as in (3.2) as a limit of graph energies by

$$\mathcal{E}_{K_w}(u\restriction_{K_w}) = \lim_{m'\to\infty} \mathcal{E}_{F_w(G_{m'})}(u\restriction_{F_w(V_{m'})})$$

for $u \in \operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K$, where $F_w(G_{m'})$ is an isomorphic image of the graph $G_{m'}$ in $G_{m+m'}$ inside the cell corresponding to the word w. Moreover, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{G_{m+m'}}(u\restriction_{V_{m+m'}}) = \sum_{w\in W_m} \mathcal{E}_{F_w(G_{m'})}(u\restriction_{F_w(V_{m'})}).$$

Passing to the limit $m' \to \infty$ gives the desired formula. □

We also need the following estimate on $|u(x) - u(y)|$ for $u \in \operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K$:

3.7. Proposition. *Let K be a fractal approximable by finite graphs with self-similar energy form $\mathcal{E}_K$. Let $x, y \in K_w$ be in a cell K_w of generation m, then*

$$\big|u(x) - u(y)\big|^2 \le \frac{r_w}{c_{-,0}} \mathcal{E}_{K_w}(u\restriction_{K_w}) \le \frac{1}{c_{-,m}} \mathcal{E}_{K_w}(u\restriction_{K_w}) \tag{3.10}$$

for all $u \in \operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K$.

Proof of Proposition 3.7. Let $w \in W_m$ and consider the m-cell K_w with energy form $\mathcal{E}_{K_w}$ as defined in Proposition 3.6. As K_w is itself a fractal (see the proof above), we have the following results: Let the so-called *resistance metric* be given by

$$\varrho_{K_w}(x,y) = \Big(\inf\big\{\, \mathcal{E}_{K_w}(\psi) \,\big|\, \psi \in \operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_{K_w}, \psi(x) = 1, \psi(y) = 0 \,\big\}\Big)^{-1}, \tag{3.11}$$

(see [Ki01, Secs. 2.3] or [St06, Sec. 4.4 and 1.6]); ϱ_{K_w} is actually a metric (cf. [Ki01, Prp. 2.3.3]. An immediate consequence of the definition of ϱ_{K_w} is

$$|u(x) - u(y)|^2 \le \varrho_{K_w}(x,y)\mathcal{E}_K(u) \qquad (x, y \in K_w). \tag{3.12}$$

(if $u(x) \neq u(y)$, then plug $\psi(z) = (u(z) - u(y))/(u(x) - u(y))$ into the defining equation for ϱ_{K_w}). Moreover, for the diameter of (K_w, ϱ_{K_w}), we have

$$\varrho_{K_w}(x,y) \le \max\{\, \varrho_{K_w}(x',y') \,|\, x', y' \in F_w(V_0) \,\} =: \operatorname{diam}(K_w, \varrho_{K_w}). \tag{3.13}$$

In particular, we have

$$|u(x) - u(y)|^2 \le \operatorname{diam}(K_w, \varrho_{K_w})\, \mathcal{E}_{K_w}(u) \tag{3.14}$$

if $x, y \in K_w$ and $u \in \operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_{K_w}$.

We finally need an estimate of the diameter of an m-cell: Let $x, y \in K_w$ be in a cell of generation m, then we can estimate $\varrho(x,y)$ by $\varrho(x',y')$ for some boundary points

$x' = F_w(x_0)$ and $y' = F_w(y_0)$ of the m-cell K_w. Let now ψ be the m-harmonic function with value 1 at x' and 0 on $V_m \setminus \{x'\}$, hence

$$\varrho_{K_w}(x', y')^{-1} \geq \mathcal{E}_{K_w}(\psi\restriction_{K_w}) = \mathcal{E}_{G_m}(\psi\restriction_{F_w(V_0)}) = \sum_{z' \sim_m x'} c_{\{x',z'\},m}$$
$$\geq c_{\{x',y'\},m} = \frac{c_{\{x_0,y_0\},0}}{r_w} \geq c_{-,m} = \frac{c_{-,0}}{r_{+,m}}$$

using (3.7) for the first equality. □

Remark. Note that the localisation of $\mathcal{E}_K$ in Proposition 3.6 allows us to consider only the energy on K_w instead of K on the right hand side. This slight detail will help us to obtain the optimal estimate in the second estimates of (2.3b) and (2.3c) in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Subsection 4.1.

3.4. Measures on fractals and graphs and the associated operators

In order to have a *closed* form, we need a Hilbert space structure on K, i.e., a measure μ on K. We assume that μ is a Borel regular probability measure of full support (see e.g. [Ki01, Sec. 1.4]). Examples such as a *self-similar* measure are given in Subsection 5.1. The Hilbert space is then $\mathsf{L}_2(K, \mu)$ with its usual inner product.

The domain $\operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K$ of $\mathcal{E}_K$ is itself a Hilbert space, and it can be shown that the embedding $\operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K \subset \mathsf{L}_2(K, \mu)$ is compact. This implies that the operator $\Delta_{(K,\mu)}$ associated with the quadratic form $\mathcal{E}_K$, i.e., the operator defined via

$$\mathcal{E}_K(u, v) = \langle \Delta_{(K,\mu)} u, v\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(K,\mu)}$$

for all $v \in \operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K$, has compact resolvent, hence also purely discrete spectrum (note that — in contrast to some literature like Kigami's or Strichartz's books [Ki01, St06] — our operator is non-*negative*, i.e, $\Delta_{(K,\mu)} \geq 0$). Moreover, it can be shown that $\operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K \subset \mathsf{C}(K)$, and it makes sense to evaluate $u \in \operatorname{dom}\mathcal{E}_K$ at points of K.

For the Hilbert space structure on the graphs G_m, we also need a measure μ_m on V_m. We set

$$\mu_m(x) = \int_K \psi_{x,m}\,\mathrm{d}\mu \tag{3.15}$$

and we call the sequence $(\mu_m)_m$ *approximating measures* corresponding to (K, μ). The measures μ_m are actually discrete probability measures of full support because the family of m-harmonic functions $\{\psi_{x,m}\}_{x\in V_m}$ forms a partition of unity and μ is a probability measure of full support on K.

By $\ell_2(V_m, \mu_m)$ we denote the finite dimensional Hilbert space $\ell(V_m)$ with norm (and hence inner product) given by

$$\|f\|^2_{\ell_2(V_m,\mu_m)} := \sum_{x\in V_m} \mu_m(x)|f(x)|^2.$$

A simple calculation shows that the (bounded) operator $\Delta_{(G_m,\mu_m)} \geq 0$ associated with the energy form $\mathcal{E}_{G_m}$ acts as

$$(\Delta_{(G_m,\mu_m)} f)(x) = \frac{1}{\mu_m(x)} \sum_{y\sim_m x} c_{\{x,y\},m}\big(f(x) - f(y)\big).$$

Moreover, the associated matrix with respect to the orthonormal basis $\{\,\delta_x \,|\, x \in V_m\,\}$ of $\ell_2(V_m,\mu_m)$ with $\delta_x(y) = \sqrt{\mu_m(x)}$ if $x = y$ and $\delta_x(y) = 0$ otherwise is given by

$$(\Delta_{(G_m,\mu_m)})_{xy} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\mu_m(x)} \sum_{z\sim_m x} c_{\{x,z\},m}, & \text{if } x = y, \\ \frac{c_{\{x,y\},m}}{\sqrt{\mu_m(x)\mu_m(y)}}, & \text{if } x \sim_m y, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3.16}$$

4. Proof of the quasi-unitary equivalence

4.1. Quasi-unitary equivalence of graph and fractal energy forms

Let $\mathscr{H}_m = \ell_2(V_m,\mu_m)$ and let $\mathcal{E}_m = \mathcal{E}_{G_m}$ be the graph energy form as in (1.2). For the limit space, we set $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}} = \mathsf{L}_2(K,\mu)$ and $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}^1} = \operatorname{dom}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_K$, where $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E}_K$ denotes the energy form on the fractal, defined as a limit in (3.2).

We will now show our first main result Theorem 1.1:

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We define the identification operators $J = J_m \colon \mathscr{H}_m \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$ and $J' = J'_m$ by

$$Jf := \sum_{x\in V_m} f(x)\psi_{x,m} \in \widetilde{\mathscr{H}}, \qquad (J'u)(y) := \frac{1}{\mu_m(y)}\langle u, \psi_{y,m}\rangle$$

for $y \in V_m$, then it is easily seen that $J^* = J'$. Moreover, we let $J^1 f := Jf$ for $f \in \mathscr{H}_m$ and let

$$J'^1 \colon \widetilde{\mathscr{H}^1} \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}^1_m \quad \text{be given by} \quad (J'^1 u)(x) = u(x),$$

the evaluation of u in $x \in V_m \subset K$.

Note that we have $x \sim_m y$ if and only if $\langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle \neq 0$ for $x, y \in V_m$ $(x \neq y)$, where $\psi_{x,m}$ is the m-harmonic function with value 1 at $x \in V_m$ and 0 elsewhere. We will make frequent use of the following relation,

$$\mu_m(y) = \int_K \psi_{y,m}\,\mathrm{d}\mu = \sum_{x\in V_m} \langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle, \tag{4.1}$$

which follows from the fact that $\sum_{y\in V_m} \psi_{y,m} = \mathbb{1}$. By the Cauchy-Young inequality and (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Jf\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(K,\mu)} &= \sum_{x,y\in V_m} f(x)\overline{f(y)}\,\underbrace{\langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(K,\mu)}}_{\geq 0} \\ &\overset{\text{CY}}{\leq} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in V_m} |f(x)|^2 \sum_{y\in V_m} \langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{y\in V_m} |f(y)|^2 \sum_{x\in V_m} \langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{x\in V_m} |f(x)|^2 \underbrace{\langle \psi_{x,m}, \mathbb{1}\rangle}_{=\mu_m(x)} = \|f\|^2_{\ell_2(V_m,\mu_m)}, \end{aligned}$$

hence we have chosen our vertex weights μ_m on V_m appropriately; in particular, the first condition (2.3a) of quasi-unitary equivalence is fulfilled as well as the second (recall that $J^* = J'$), both with $\delta = 0$.

Let us now check the first estimate in (2.3b): Let $x \in V_m$. We apply (4.1) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(f - J'Jf)(y) &= f(y) - \frac{1}{\mu_m(y)} \sum_{x\in V_m} f(x)\langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu_m(y)} \sum_{x\in V_m} \langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle (f(y) - f(x)).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $f \in \mathscr{H}_m$, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\|f - J'Jf\|^2_{\mathscr{H}_m} &= \sum_{y\in V_m} \frac{1}{\mu_m(y)} \Big| \sum_{x\in V_m} \langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle (f(y) - f(x))\Big|^2 \\ &\overset{\text{CS}}{\le} \sum_{y\in V_m} \frac{1}{\mu_m(y)} \Big(\sum_{x\in V_m} \frac{\langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle^2}{c_{\{x,y\},m}} \Big) \sum_{x\sim_m y} c_{\{x,y\},m} |f(y) - f(x)|^2 \\ &\le \frac{1}{c_{-,m}} \Big(\max_{y\in V_m} \frac{1}{\mu_m(y)} \sum_{x\in V_m} \langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle^2 \Big) \mathcal{E}_m(f)\end{aligned}$$

using (3.5) for the last estimate. Now

$$\max_{y\in V_m} \frac{1}{\mu_m(y)} \sum_{x\in V_m} \langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle^2 \le \max_{y\in V_m} \sum_{x\in V_m} \langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle = \max_{y\in V_m} \mu_m(y) \le \mu_{+,m}$$

using $\langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle \le \langle \mathbb{1}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle = \mu_m(y))$ for the first inequality, (4.1) for the equality and $\psi_{m,y} \le 1$ for the last inequality. Moreover, we have estimated $\mu_m(y)$ by

$$\mu_{+,m} := \max\big\{ \max_{x\in V_m} \mu_m(x), \max_{w\in W_m} \mu(K_w) \big\} \tag{4.2}$$

(the reason for the second term will become clear in a moment). In particular, the first estimate in (2.3b) holds with $\delta = (\mu_{+,m}/c_{-,m})^{1/2}$.

Next we prove the second inequality of (2.3b); actually, we will show estimate (2.4): We have

$$u - JJ'^1 u = u - \sum_{x\in V_m} u(x)\psi_{x,m} = \sum_{x\in V_m} (u - u(x))\psi_{x,m} = \sum_{w\in W_m} \sum_{x\in F_w(V_0)} (u - u(x))\psi_{x,m}\restriction_{K_w}$$

almost everywhere for any $u \in \mathscr{H}$ using the fact that $\{\psi_{x,m}\}_{x\in V_m}$ is a partition of unity. In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u - JJ'^1 u\|^2_{\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}} &= \sum_{w\in W_m} \|u - JJ'^1 u\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(K_w)} \\ &\le \sum_{w\in W_m} \sum_{x,y\in F_w(V_0)} \langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(K_w)} \max_{x,z\in K_w} |u(x) - u(z)| \max_{y,z\in K_w} |u(y) - u(z)| \\ &\le \frac{1}{c_{-,m}} \sum_{w\in W_m} \sum_{x,y\in F_w(V_0)} \langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(K_w)} \mathcal{E}_{K_w}(u\restriction_{K_w}) \\ &= \frac{1}{c_{-,m}} \sum_{w\in W_m} \mu(K_w) \mathcal{E}_{K_w}(u\restriction_{K_w}) \\ &\le \frac{\mu_{+,m}}{c_{-,m}} \mathcal{E}(u)\end{aligned}$$

using Proposition 3.7 for the second inequality, $\sum_{x\in F_w(V_0)} \psi_{x,m}\restriction_{K_w} = \mathbb{1}_{K_w}$ for the fourth line and Proposition 3.6 resp. (4.2) for the final inequality. In particular, we can again choose $\delta' = (\mu_{+,m}/c_{-,m})^{1/2}$ in (2.4).

For the second estimate in (2.3c) (the first one is trivially fulfilled), let $u \in \mathscr{H}$ and $x \in V_m$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(J'u - J'^1u)(x) &= \frac{1}{\mu_m(x)}\langle u, \psi_{x,m}\rangle - u(x) = \frac{1}{\mu_m(x)}\big\langle u - u(x)\mathbb{1}, \psi_{x,m}\big\rangle \\ &= \sum_{w\in W_{x,m}} \frac{1}{\mu_m(x)}\big\langle u - u(x)\mathbb{1}, \psi_{x,m}\big\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(K_w)},\end{aligned}$$

where $W_{x,m} := \{\, w \in W_m \,|\, x \in K_w \,\}$ are the words which m-cells contain x. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\big|(J'u - J'^1u)(x)\big|^2 &\le \Big(\sum_{w\in W_{x,m}} \frac{1}{\mu_m(x)} \int_{K_w} |u - u(x)|\psi_{x,m}\,\mathrm{d}\mu\Big)^2 \\ &\le \frac{1}{c_{-,m}} \max_{w\in W_{x,m}} \mathcal{E}_{K_w}\big(u\restriction_{K_w}\big)\Big(\frac{1}{\mu_m(x)} \sum_{w\in W_{x,m}} \int_{K_w} \psi_{x,m}\,\mathrm{d}\mu\Big)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{c_{-,m}} \max_{w\in W_{x,m}} \mathcal{E}_{K_w}\big(u\restriction_{K_w}\big) \le \frac{1}{c_{-,m}} \sum_{w\in W_{x,m}} \mathcal{E}_{K_w}\big(u\restriction_{K_w}\big)\end{aligned}$$

using Proposition 3.7 for the second inequality, $\sum_{w\in W_{x,m}} \int_{K_w} \psi_{x,m}\,\mathrm{d}\mu = \mu_m(x)$ for the last line. Now, we obtain for the norm estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\|J'u - J'^1u\|^2_{\mathscr{H}_m} &\le \frac{1}{c_{-,m}} \sum_{x\in V_m} \sum_{w\in W_{x,m}} \mathcal{E}_{K_w}\big(u\restriction_{K_w}\big)\mu_m(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{c_{-,m}} \sum_{w\in W_m} \mathcal{E}_{K_w}\big(u\restriction_{K_w}\big) \sum_{x\in F_w(V_0)} \mu_m(x) \\ &\le \frac{N_0\mu_{+,m}}{c_{-,m}} \sum_{w\in W_m} \mathcal{E}_{K_w}(u\restriction_{K_w}) = \frac{N_0\mu_{+,m}}{c_{-,m}} \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(u)\end{aligned}$$

using (4.2) resp. Proposition 3.6 for the last line (here $N_0 = |V_0|$ denotes the number of boundary vertices).

Finally, we check the last condition (2.3d) of quasi-unitary equivalence: For any $f = \sum_{x\in V_m} f(x)\psi_{x,m}\restriction_{V_m} \in \mathscr{H}_m$ and $u \in \mathscr{H}^1$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_m(f, J'^1u) - \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(J^1f, u) = \sum_{x\in V_m} f(x)\big(\mathcal{E}_m(\psi_{x,m}\restriction_{V_m}, u\restriction_{V_m}) - \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\psi_{x,m}, u)\big) = 0$$

using (3.8). We now apply Lemma 2.3 and obtain (2.3b) with $\delta_{\mathrm{a}} = 0$, $\delta' = (\mu_{+,m}/c_{-,m})^{1/2}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{c}} = (N_0\mu_{+,m}/c_{-,m})^{1/2}$. Then $\delta = \delta' + \delta_{\mathrm{c}} = (1 + \sqrt{N_0})(\mu_{+,m}/c_{-,m})^{1/2}$. Collecting all the individual error terms, the quasi-unitary equivalence constant is then

$$\delta_m = (1 + \sqrt{N_0}) \cdot \Big(\frac{\mu_{+,m}}{c_{-,m}}\Big)^{1/2} = \frac{1 + \sqrt{N_0}}{\sqrt{c_{-,0}}} \cdot \Big(\frac{\mu_{+,m}}{r_-^m}\Big)^{1/2}. \tag{4.3}$$

□

Note that for a general probability measure μ (not necessarily self-similar), we have at least the estimate $\mu_{+,m} \le 1$ and hence the following result:

4.1. Corollary. *The δ_m-quasi unitary equivalence of the fractal energy form $\mathcal{E}_K$ with general Borel regular probability measure μ of full support and the approximating graph*

energy forms $\mathcal{E}_m = \mathcal{E}_{G_m}$ as in Theorem 1.1 holds with

$$\delta_m = \frac{1+\sqrt{N_0}}{\sqrt{c_{-,0}}} \cdot r_-^{-m/2}.$$

If the measure is self-similar or if the fractal, its measure and boundary are symmetric, we can obtain better estimates, see Subsection 5.2.

4.2. Remark. Our results also extends to certain classes of finitely ramified fractals as introduced in [T08]: if there is a compatible sequence of energy (or more precisely, resistance) forms on the boundary structure $(V_m)_m$. If the diameter of m-cells tends to 0 in the resistance metric, and if one chooses a measure such that the measure of m-cells tends to 0, then we obtain a similar result as Theorem 1.1.

4.3. Remark. Let us comment on the finite element method (FEM) for fractals developed in [GRSt01, ASStT03]. In our notation, one can find for example an approximative eigenvalue λ_m of an eigenvalue $\widetilde{\lambda}$ of $\Delta_{(K,\mu)}$ by finding a non-trivial solution $f \in \ell_2(V_m, \mu_m)$ (or a vector $f \in \mathbb{C}^{V_m}$) of the generalised eigenvalue problem

$$C_m f = \lambda_m G_m f,$$

where the matrices C_m and G_m are given by

$$(C_m)_{xy} = \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m}) = \mathcal{E}_m(\delta_x, \delta_y) = \begin{cases} c_{\{x,y\},m}, & \text{if } x \sim_m y \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$(G_m)_{xy} = \langle \psi_{x,m}, \psi_{y,m} \rangle_{\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}}.$$

The latter matrix is also called the *Gram matrix* of $(\psi_{x,m})_{x\in V_m}$. As a candidate for f, one can choose e.g. evaluation of u at the vertices V_m, i.e., $f = J'^1 u$. Then f is the coefficient vector of the harmonic interpolation spline $JJ'^1 u = \sum_{x\in V_m} f(x)\psi_{x,m}$ in our notation. We show actually as one condition of quasi-unitary equivalence that the harmonic spline $Jf = JJ'^1 u$ is close to the original u for large $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

4.2. A direct eigenvalue convergence result

Although an eigenvalue convergence already follows from quasi-unitary equivalence as in Corollary 1.4, we show a more explicit convergence using Proposition 2.7:

4.4. Theorem. *Let (K,μ) be a pcf fractal with Borel regular probability measure of full support approximable by finite weighted graphs (G_m,μ_m) and let $\lambda_k(G_m,\mu_m)$ resp. $\lambda_k(K,\mu)$ be the k-th eigenvalue of the Laplacian operator associated with (G_m,μ_m) resp. (K,μ) (in increasing order, repeated according to their multiplicity). Then*

$$\frac{1-\delta_m}{1+\delta_m\lambda_{k,+}} \cdot \lambda_k(G_m,\mu_m) \le \lambda_k(K,\mu) \le \frac{1}{1-\delta_m(1+\lambda_{k,+})} \cdot \lambda_k(G_m,\mu_m) \tag{4.4}$$

provided $m \ge m_0$ such that $\delta_m < (1+\lambda_{k,+})^{-1}$ and $\lambda_k(G_m,\mu_m) \le \lambda_{k,+}$, where δ_m is as in Theorem 1.1 resp. (4.3).

If $\delta_m \le (1+\lambda_k(K,\mu))^{-1}/2$, then we can choose as upper bound

$$\lambda_k(G_m,\mu_m) \le 2\lambda_k(K,\mu) =: \lambda_{k,+}. \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. We apply Proposition 2.7 with $\mathscr{H} = \ell_2(V_m,\mu_m)$ and $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}} = \mathsf{L}_2(K,\mu)$ etc. We note first that (2.9a) is trivially fulfilled (even with equality) as

$$(J'^1 J^1 f)(y) = \sum_{x\in V_m} f(x)\psi_{x,m}(y) = f(y).$$

In particular, the upper estimate on $\lambda_k(K,\mu)$ in (4.4) holds (using the second inequality in (2.9c)).

For the lower bound (4.4), we note that (2.9b) is fulfilled as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(u, J^1 J'^1 u) = \mathcal{E}_m(u\restriction_{V_m}, (J^1 J'^1 u)\restriction_{V_m}) = \mathcal{E}_m(u\restriction_{V_m}, u\restriction_{V_m}) \leq \mathcal{E}(u,u)$$

using (3.8) and (3.7).

For the upper bound in (4.5) we use the first inequality in (2.9c). □

Note that a rough estimate on $\lambda_k(G_m,\mu_m)$ in terms of the maximal possible value ϱ_m of an eigenvalue of $\Delta_{(G_m,\mu_m)}$ is not enough, as $\delta_m \varrho_m \to \infty$ as $m \to \infty$.

4.3. Eigenvalue estimates for subsequent graphs

If the measure μ is self-similar (see Subsection 5.1), then we can also show that the k-th eigenvalue of the graph energy forms $\mathcal{E}_m$ and $\mathcal{E}_{m+1}$ are close to each other. Denote by $\lambda_k(G_m,\mu_m)$ the k-th eigenvalue of the graph Laplacian Δ_m associated with $\mathcal{E}_m$ (in increasing order, repeated according to the multiplicity). Blasiak, Strichartz and Ugurcan [BStU08, text after eq. (2.9)] believe that the sequence $(\lambda_k(G_m,\mu_m))_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ is monotonely increasing. We can at least show the following:

4.5. Proposition. *Assume that the measure μ on K is self-similar, then we have*

$$\lambda_k(G_m,\mu_m) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \dfrac{\lambda_{k,+}}{\lambda_1^{\mathrm{D}}} \cdot (\mu_+ r_-)^m} \cdot \lambda_k(G_{m+1},\mu_{m+1})$$

where $\lambda_1^{\mathrm{D}} > 0$ is the smallest eigenvalue of the Dirichlet Laplacian (the Laplacian $\Delta_{(G_1,\mu_1)}$ restricted to $V_1 \setminus V_0$) and where $\lambda_{k,+}$ is an upper bound on $\lambda_k(G_{m+1},\mu_{m+1})$.

Proof. We apply Proposition 2.6 with

$$J = J_{m+1,m} \colon \mathscr{H}_{m+1} = \ell_2(V_{m+1},\mu_{m+1}) \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}_m = \ell_2(V_m,\mu_m), \qquad Ju := u\restriction_{V_m},$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Ju\|^2_{\ell_2(V_m)} - \|u\|^2_{\ell_2(V_{m+1})} &= \sum_{x\in V_m} |u(x)|^2(\mu_m(x) - \mu_{m+1}(x)) - \sum_{x\in V_{m+1}\setminus V_m} |u(x)|^2 \mu_{m+1}(x) \\
&\geq \|u\|^2_{\ell_2(V_m)}(1-\mu_-) - \|u\|^2_{\ell_2(V_{m+1}\setminus V_m,\mu_{m+1})} \\
&\geq -\|u\|^2_{\ell_2(V_{m+1}\setminus V_m,\mu_{m+1})} \qquad (4.6)
\end{aligned}$$

as $\mu_{m+1}(x) \geq \mu_- \mu_m(x)$ for $x \in V_m$ (using (5.2)).

We can consider $\Delta_{(G_{m+1},\mu_{m+1})}$ restricted to $\ell_2(V_{m+1}\setminus V_m,\mu_{m+1})$ as *Dirichlet Laplacian* (denoted by $\Delta^{\mathrm{D}}_{(G_{m+1},\mu_{m+1})}$) with Dirichlet boundary condition on the "boundary" $V_m \subset V_{m+1}$ (see e.g. [P16, Sec. 6.7]). We then have (using a variant of the min-max characterisation of eigenvalues)

$$\lambda_1(\Delta^{\mathrm{D}}_{(G_{m+1},\mu_{m+1})}) \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}_{m+1}(u)}{\|u\|^2_{\ell_2(V_{m+1}\setminus V_m,\mu_{m+1})}} \qquad (4.7)$$

for any $u \colon V_{m+1}\setminus V_m \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Note that a Dirichlet eigenvalue is always positive.

As the Dirichlet Laplacian on $V_{m+1} \setminus V_m$ is a direct sum of a rescaled copy of the one on $V_1 \setminus V_0$, we can estimate the first eigenvalue on generation $m+1$ by

$$\lambda_1(\Delta^{\mathrm{D}}_{(G_{m+1},\mu_{m+1})}) = \inf_u \frac{\mathcal{E}_{m+1}(u)}{\|u\|^2_{\ell_2(V_{m+1}\setminus V_m,\mu_{m+1})}}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{(r_+\mu_-)^m} \inf_{u_1} \frac{\mathcal{E}_1(u)}{\|u\|^2_{\ell_2(V_1\setminus V_0,\mu_1)}} = \frac{1}{(r_+\mu_-)^m} \overbrace{\lambda_1(\Delta^{\mathrm{D}}_{(G_1,\mu_1)})}^{=:\lambda_1^{\mathrm{D}}} \tag{4.8}$$

using (3.4), (3.5) and (5.1) (as μ_- is the minimum of the measure scaling factors μ_j). We conclude from (4.6) and the Dirichlet eigenvalue estimates (4.7)–(4.8) that

$$\|Ju\|^2_{\ell_2(V_m)} - \|u\|^2_{\ell_2(V_{m+1})} \geq -\frac{1}{\lambda_1(\Delta^{\mathrm{D}}_{(G_{m+1},\mu_{m+1})})}\mathcal{E}_{m+1}(u) \geq -\frac{(r_+\mu_-)^m}{\lambda_1^{\mathrm{D}}}\mathcal{E}_{m+1}(u),$$

and we can choose $\delta_1 = (r_+\mu_-)^m/\lambda_1^{\mathrm{D}}$ in Proposition 2.6. As $\mathcal{E}_m(u\restriction_{V_m}) \leq \mathcal{E}_{m+1}(u)$ by the compatibility of $(\mathcal{E}_{G_m})_m$ the condition on the energy forms in Proposition 2.6 is also fulfilled. The result now follows from Proposition 2.6. □

4.6. Remark. If the fractal is symmetric with symmetric measure (see Subsection 5.2), then $(\mu_+ r_-)^m = (r_0/N)^m$, and the factor is of the form $1 + \mathrm{O}((r_0/N)^m)$, depending on the a priori bound $\lambda_{k,+}$ on $\lambda_k(G_{m+1},\mu_{m+1})$, hence the sequence $(\lambda_k(G_m,\mu_m))_m$ is close to a monotonely increasing sequence at least for large m.

5. Examples

In this section we present some classes of examples and some concrete ones. Note that the contraction ratio θ_j does not play any role in the convergence results.

5.1. Self-similar and other measures on pcf fractals

A probability measure μ on K is called *self-similar*, if μ is a Borel regular probability measure and if there are so-called *measure scaling parameters* $\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_N > 0$ such that

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{j=1}^N \mu_j \mu(F_j^{-1}(A)) \tag{5.1}$$

for all Borel sets $A \subset K$. Note that a self-similar measure always exists for any fractal K defined via a (finite) IFS. In particular, an m-cell $K_w = F_w(K)$ has measure

$$\mu(K_w) = \mu_{w_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu_{w_m},$$

hence

$$\mu_{m,-} = (\mu_-)^m, \qquad \text{where} \qquad \mu_- := \min\{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_N\} \in (0,1). \tag{5.2}$$

One choice of measure is given by

$$\mu_j = r_j^d,$$

where d is defined by $\sum_{j=1}^N r_j^d = 1$. Here, d is the Hausdorff dimension of (K,ϱ), cf. [Ki01, Thm. 4.2.1], where ϱ is the *resistance metric*, cf. (3.11). If the embedding space $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ is the Euclidean space, then we can also calculate the Hausdorff dimension d_{eucl} of K with respect to the *Euclidean* metric: the number d_{eucl} is defined via $\sum_{j=1}^N \theta_j^{d_{\mathrm{eucl}}} = 1$ for self-similar sets satisfying the so-called *open set condition* (see e.g. [Ki01, Sec. 1.5]). Here, θ_j is the contraction ratio of the contractive similarity $F_j\colon \mathbb{R}^d \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$.

There is another natural measure on a fractal, namely the *Kusuoka energy measure*. For a definition, see e.g. [T08, Def. 3.4]. A good reference and a link to the unusual properties of the domain of the Laplacian on a fractal can be found in [BBStT99]. There is even an explicit formula (cf. [T08, Thm. 6.1]) for the Laplacian $\Delta_{(K,\mu)}$, if μ is the Kusuoka energy measure resembling the Laplacian of a Riemannian manifold (normalised to $\mu(K) = 1$). Theorem 1.1 applies also to this setting; one just needs to calculate $\mu_m(x) = \int_K \psi_{x,m} \, \mathrm{d}\mu$ with respect to this measure.

5.2. Symmetric pcf fractals

5.1. Definition.

(i) We call a self-similar measure μ *symmetric* or *standard* if the measure rescaling parameters are all the same, namely

$$\mu_j = \frac{1}{N}$$

for $j = 1, \dots, N$.

(ii) We say that a fractal K approximable by finite graphs is *symmetric*, if all contraction ratios θ_j of the IFS are the same and if all energy renormalisation parameters r_j of the energy forms are the same, i.e., there exists $\theta_0, r_0 \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\theta_0 = \theta_j \qquad \text{and} \qquad r_0 = r_j,$$

for all $j = 1, \dots, N$.

(iii) We say that (K, μ) is symmetric if K is a symmetric fractal together with a symmetric self-similar measure μ.

(iv) Let $V_0 \subset K$ be the boundary of a fractal K approximable by finite graphs. We say that V_0 is *symmetric*, if the weights $\mu_0(x_0) = \int_K \psi_{x_0,0} \, \mathrm{d}\mu$ are all the same, namely

$$\mu_0(x_0) = \frac{1}{N_0}$$

for all $x_0 \in V_0$ (recall that $N_0 := |V_0| \leq N$ and that $\sum_{x_0 \in V_0)} \mu_0(x_0) = \mu(K) = 1$).

For a symmetric fractal K, the Hausdorff dimension of K with respect to the resistance metric (3.11) is given by $d = -\log N / \log r_0 > 0$. Moreover, the Hausdorff dimension of K with the induced metric from the Euclidean ambient space is $d_{\mathrm{eucl}} = -\log N / \log \theta_0 > 0$.

Recall that $W_{x,m} = \{\, w \in W_m \,|\, x \in K_w \,\}$ denotes the set of words w such that the corresponding cells K_w meet in the vertex $x \in V_m$. Denote by

$$N_1 := \max_{x \in V_m} |W_{x,m}|$$

the maximal number of cells meeting in one vertex (note that we have $N_1 \leq N_0 \leq N$). We can now estimate the weights $\mu_m(x)$ and $\mu_{+,m}$:

5.2. Lemma. *Let K be a symmetric fractal and μ be a symmetric self-similar measure.*

(i) *All m-cells K_w have the same measure, namely*

$$\mu(K_w) = \frac{1}{N^m} \tag{5.3a}$$

for all $w \in W_m$.

(ii) *The vertex measure $\mu_m(x)$ fulfils*

$$\mu_m(x) \leq \frac{|W_{x,m}|}{N^m} \leq \frac{N_1}{N^m} \leq \frac{1}{N^{m-1}}. \tag{5.3b}$$

(iii) *If, in addition, the boundary V_0 of K is symmetric, then we have*

$$\mu_m(x) = \frac{|W_{x,m}|}{N_0 N^m} \leq \frac{N_1}{N_0 N^m} \leq \frac{1}{N^m}. \tag{5.3c}$$

Proof. Eq. (5.3a) follows from the scaling property (5.1) μ with $\mu_j = 1/N$. Eq. (5.3b) is a direct consequence using the estimate $\psi_{x,m} \leq 1$ and the fact that $\operatorname{supp} \psi_{x,m} = \bigcup_{w \in W_{x,m}} K_w$. Finally, (5.3c) follows again by the scaling property (5.1). □

We immediately conclude together with Theorem 1.1:

5.3. Corollary. *Assume that K is a symmetric fractal with symmetric self-similar measure μ, then the δ_m-quasi unitary equivalence of the fractal energy form $\mathcal{E}_K$ and the approximating graph energy forms $\mathcal{E}_m = \mathcal{E}_{G_m}$ as in Theorem 1.1 holds with*

$$\delta_m = \frac{(1+\sqrt{N_0})\sqrt{N_1}}{\sqrt{c_{-,0}}} \cdot \left(\frac{r_0}{N}\right)^{m/2}.$$

If in addition, the boundary V_0 of K is also symmetric, then Theorem 1.1 holds with

$$\delta_m = \frac{(1+\sqrt{N_0})\sqrt{N_1}}{\sqrt{c_{-,0} N_0}} \cdot \left(\frac{r_0}{N}\right)^{m/2}.$$

Proof. Recall the definition of $\mu_{+,m}$ in (4.2). From Lemma 5.2 we conclude

$$\mu_{+,m} = \frac{N_1}{N^m} \leq \frac{1}{N^{m-1}} \quad \text{resp.} \quad \mu_{+,m} = \frac{N_1}{N_0 N^m} \leq \frac{1}{N^m}$$

in the case of a non-symmetric resp. symmetric boundary, hence the result follows from the expression of δ_m in (4.3) for Theorem 1.1. □

For a symmetric fractal K, the number of vertices $|V_m|$ is given recursively by $|V_0| = N_0$ and $|V_{m+1}| := N|V_m| - b$, where b is the number of vertices identified from one generation to the next one. In particular, we have

$$|V_0| = N_0, \qquad |V_m| = N^m N_0 - \frac{N^m - 1}{N-1} b,$$

and $|V_m| = N^m N_0 + \mathrm{O}(N^{m-1})$ if $m \to \infty$, i.e., the size of the approximating matrices of $\Delta_{(G_m,\mu_m)}$ increases of order $N^m N_0$ as $m \to \infty$.

5.3. Sierpiński gasket and related fractals

The unit interval. The unit interval $K = [0,1]$ can be seen as a self-similar fractal with $F_1(x) = x/2$ and $F_2(x) = x/2 + 1/2$ with boundary $V_0 = \{0,1\}$. This fractal is symmetric, and if we choose the symmetric self-similar measure μ (which is here the one-dimensional Lebesgue measure). In particular, K, μ and V_0 are all symmetric and we have

$$N = N_0 = N_1 = 2, \qquad \theta_0 = \frac{1}{2}, \qquad r_0 = \frac{1}{2}, \qquad b = 1, \qquad |V_m| = 2^m + 1.$$

Moreover, the conductances at generation 0 are $c_{e_0} = 1$ for the single edge e_0 in G_0. The approximating graphs G_m are path graphs with $2^m + 1$ vertices. The error is then given by

$$\delta_m = (1+\sqrt{2}) \cdot \frac{1}{2^m}.$$

This convergence rate is quite good, as δ_m is smaller than 0.01 for $m \geq 8$, and the number of vertices is still not too large, namely $|V_8| = 2^8 + 1 = 257$.

Sierpiński gasket. The Sierpiński gasket is given by three contractions with ratio $\theta_0 = 1/2$ and fixed points at the vertices of an equilateral triangle. Here, $N = N_0 = 3$ and $N_1 = 2$. Again, this fractal is symmetric and we fix the symmetric measure μ; also the boundary is symmetric. In particular, we have

$$N = N_0 = 3, \qquad N_1 = 2, \qquad \theta_0 = \frac{1}{2}, \qquad r_0 = \frac{3}{5}, \qquad b = 3, \qquad |V_m| = \frac{3}{2}\left(3^m + 1\right).$$

Moreover, we have $c_{e_0} = 1$; and the error is given by

$$\delta_m = \frac{(1+\sqrt{3})\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot \frac{1}{5^{m/2}}.$$

The error δ_m is smaller than 0.01 for $m \geq 7$, but the number of vertices is then already quite large, namely $|V_7| = 3282$.

Sierpiński gaskets in higher dimension. Here, we consider the self-similar symmetric set in $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ for $N \geq 2$ with contraction ratio $\theta_0 = 1/2$ and N fixed points lying on an N-dimensional pyramid with side length 1. For $N = 2$, this is the interval, for $N = 3$ the fractal is the Sierpiński gasket and for $N = 4$ the Sierpiński pyramid. We also have $N_0 = N$ and $N_1 = 2$ (at most two cells meet). Also the boundary is symmetric. We have here

$$N = N_0, \quad N_1 = 2, \quad \theta_0 = \frac{1}{2}, \quad r_0 = \frac{N}{N+2}, \quad b = \frac{N(N-1)}{2}, \quad |V_m| \ = \frac{N}{2}\left(N^m + 1\right).$$

Moreover, we have $c_{e_0} = 1$; and the error is given by

$$\delta_m = \frac{(1+\sqrt{N})\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{N}} \cdot \frac{1}{(N+2)^{m/2}}.$$

If e.g. $N = 4$, we have δ_m smaller than 0.01 for $m \geq 6$, but the number of vertices is then already quite large, namely $|V_6| = 8194$.

Related fractals. The *level n Sierpiński gasket* SG_n is a self-similar compact set in $\mathbb{R}^2$ defined as follows (see e.g. [St06, Ex. 4.1.1, Fig. 4.1.1]): subdivide an equilateral triangle into $3(n-1)$ equilateral triangles of side length $\theta_0 = \theta_j = 1/n$ of the original side length. Each of these $3(n-1)$ triangles can be obtained by a similarity from the original triangle with contraction ratio $1/n$ and a fixed point. Hence, we have $N = 3(n-1)$ fixed points, and only the 3 fixed points on the vertices of the original triangle form the boundary, hence $N_0 = 3$. By D_3-symmetry, we choose all conductances c_{e_0} to be equal, say 1. The renormalisation factors are again all the same and given e.g. for $n = 3$ by $r_0 = 7/15$ (see [St06, Ex. 4.3.1]). The level n Sierpiński gasket is an example of a fractal where up to 3 cells meet at a junction point (if $n = 3$, it is the junction point in the centre of a cell in the previous generation), hence $N_1 = 3$. For the level 3 Sierpiński gasket, we have

$$N = 6, \qquad N_0 = N_1 = 3, \qquad \theta_0 = \frac{1}{2}, \qquad r_0 = \frac{7}{15}, \qquad b = 8, \qquad |V_m| = \frac{7}{5} \cdot 6^m + \frac{8}{5}.$$

Moreover, we can choose $c_{e_0} = 1$ for all three edges of G_0; and the error is given by

$$\delta_m = \frac{(1+\sqrt{3})\sqrt{3}}{\sqrt{3}} \left(\frac{7/15}{6}\right)^{m/2} = (1+\sqrt{3}) \left(\frac{7}{90}\right)^{m/2}.$$

The error δ_m is smaller than 0.01 for $m \geq 5$, but the number of vertices is then already quite large, namely $|V_5| = 10888$.

5.4. Pentagasket

The pentagasket is the self-similar structure with five similarities of contraction ratio $\theta_0 = (3-\sqrt{5})/2 \approx 0.382$ and fixed points located at the vertices of a pentagon (see [ASStT03] or [St06, Example 4.3.3 and Exercise 4.3.2]).

One can start with all five vertices as V_0, hence G_0 is the complete graph K_5 with $|E_0| = 10$ edges (not embeddable in the plane), cf. Figure 1. Here, we have $N = N_0 = 5$, and at most $N_1 = 2$ cells meet in one vertex. Moreover,

$$\theta_0 = \frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 0.382, \quad r_0 = \frac{\sqrt{161}-9}{8} \approx 0.461, \quad b = 5, \quad |V_m| = \frac{15}{4}\cdot 5^m + \frac{5}{4}.$$

Moreover, the conductances of the 10 edges at generation 0 can be chosen to be

$$c_{e_0} = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\sqrt{161}-7}{16} \approx 0.356 & \text{if } e_0 \text{ is on the pentagon} \\ \dfrac{15-\sqrt{161}}{16} \approx 0.144 & \text{if } e_0 \text{ joins every second vertex} \end{cases}$$

By symmetry, the five elementary harmonic functions on K all have the same integral value $\int_K \psi_{x_0,0}\,\mathrm{d}\mu = 1/5$ for $x_0 \in V_0$, hence $\mu_m(x) = 2/5^{m+1}$ if x is a junction point and $\mu_m(x) = 1/5^{m+1}$ if not. Moreover, any m-cells has measure $1/5^m$, hence $\mu_{+,m} = 1/5^m$.

The error is then given by

$$\delta_m = \frac{(1+\sqrt{5})\sqrt{2}}{(c_{-,0})^{1/2}\sqrt{5}} \cdot \Big(\frac{\sqrt{161}-9}{5\cdot 8}\Big)^{m/2} \le 5.3848 \cdot 0.3037^m$$

see (4.3). Here, $q := ((\sqrt{161}-9)/40)^{1/2} = 0.30366\ldots \le 0.3037$; so q^m is smaller than 0.01 for $m \ge 6$, and the number of vertices is then $|V_6| = 58595$.

A fractal with non-symmetric boundary. If we start with only three boundary points V_0 (two opposite of the third on the pentagon), and if one uses the five similarities first contracting towards the fixed point and then rotating around the centre of the pentagon by $2\pi/5$, then one obtains another approximating sequence for the pentagasket, see



FIGURE 2. The pentagasket approximation graphs G_m starting with only three boundary vertices for $m = 0, \ldots, 3$ with $(|V_m|)_m = (3, 10, 10\cdot 5 - 5 = 45, 45\cdot 5 - 5 = 220, \ldots)$.

Figure 2. Here

$$c_{e_0} = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\sqrt{161}-7}{14} \approx 0.406 & \text{if } e_0 \text{ is the base (shorter side) of } G_0 \\ \dfrac{21-\sqrt{161}}{28} \approx 0.297 & \text{if } e_0 \text{ is one of the sides of } G_0. \end{cases}$$

Note that G_0 is an isosceles triangle, hence the fractal has no longer a symmetric boundary (as the rotational symmetry of G_0 is no longer present). The renormalisation factor

$r_0 = (\sqrt{161} - 9)/8$ is the same as above, only $N_0 = 3$ and $|V_m| = \frac{7}{4} \cdot 5^m + \frac{5}{4}$ changes from the above setting, hence the error term δ_m is the same as above, just with the factor $(1 + \sqrt{5})\sqrt{2}/((c_{-,0})^{1/2}\sqrt{5}) \leq 5.3848$ replaced by $(1 + \sqrt{3})\sqrt{2}/(c_{-,0})^{1/2} \leq 7.0917$. Moreover, δ_m is smaller than 0.01 if $m \geq 6$, and here $|V_6| = 27345$.

References

[ASStT03] B. Adams, S. A. Smith, R. S. Strichartz, and A. Teplyaev, *The spectrum of the Laplacian on the pentagasket*, Fractals in Graz 2001, Trends Math., Birkhäuser, Basel, 2003, pp. 1–24.

[BBStT99] O. Ben-Bassat, R. S. Strichartz, and A. Teplyaev, *What is not in the domain of the Laplacian on Sierpinski gasket type fractals*, J. Funct. Anal. **166** (1999), 197–217.

[BHSt09] T. Berry, S. M. Heilman, and R. S. Strichartz, *Outer approximation of the spectrum of a fractal Laplacian*, Experiment. Math. **18** (2009), 449–480.

[BStU08] A. Blasiak, R. S. Strichartz, and B. E. Ugurcan, *Spectra of self-similar Laplacians on the Sierpinski gasket with twists*, Fractals **16** (2008), 43–68.

[GRSt01] M. Gibbons, A. Raj, and R. S. Strichartz, *The finite element method on the Sierpinski gasket*, Constr. Approx. **17** (2001), 561–588.

[HT15] M. Hinz and A. Teplyaev, *Closability, regularity, and approximation by graphs for separable bilinear forms*, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI) **441** (2015), 299–317.

[IPR$^+$10] M. Ionescu, E. P. J. Pearse, L. G. Rogers, H.-J. Ruan, and R. S. Strichartz, *The resolvent kernel for PCF self-similar fractals*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **362** (2010), 4451–4479.

[K66] T. Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1966.

[Ki01] J. Kigami, *Analysis on fractals*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 143, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.

[KuS03] K. Kuwae and T. Shioya, *Convergence of spectral structures: a functional analytic theory and its applications to spectral geometry*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **11** (2003), 599–673.

[M94] U. Mosco, *Composite media and asymptotic Dirichlet forms*, J. Funct. Anal. **123** (1994), 368–421.

[Pos06] O. Post, *Spectral convergence of quasi-one-dimensional spaces*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **7** (2006), 933–973.

[P12] ———, *Spectral analysis on graph-like spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 2039, Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.

[P16] ———, *Boundary pairs associated with quadratic forms*, Math. Nachr. **289** (2016), 1052–1099.

[P17] ———, *Abstract graph-like space and vector-valued metric graphs*, to appear in a special issue for Pavel Exner's 70th birthday (2016).

[PS17] O. Post and J. Simmer, *Approximation of fractals by graph-like spaces: norm convergence of resolvents and spectra*, (in preparation) (2017).

[RS80] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of modern mathematical physics I: Functional analysis*, Academic Press, New York, 1980.

[Sh96] T. Shima, *On eigenvalue problems for Laplacians on p.c.f. self-similar sets*, Japan J. Indust. Appl. Math. **13** (1996), 1–23.

[St03] R. S. Strichartz, *Fractafolds based on the Sierpiński gasket and their spectra*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **355** (2003), 4019–4043.

[St06] ———, *Differential equations on fractals*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2006.

[StU00] R. S. Strichartz and M. Usher, *Splines on fractals*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **129** (2000), 331–360.

[T08] A. Teplyaev, *Harmonic coordinates on fractals with finitely ramified cell structure*, Canad. J. Math. **60** (2008), 457–480.